



strapping one to the steering wheel is duck soup. Voila! A very cheap computer right in front of your face while zipping down the road. Guaranteed to bring your code speed real close to your speedometer indication!

Which brings up the next point...

>Wonder what others think here...wouldn't it be best to learn code  
>by head copy and not paper & pencil copy?

A resounding "NAH!" would be in order here. Head copy is OK for SOME aspects of Amateur Radio operation. But durned few! Let me list some examples of where head copy does NOT suffice:

1. Taking an Amateur Radio or commercial CW exam.
2. Handling message traffic for the public.
3. Contests
4. DX'ing

In the latter two instances, of course, you can get away with SOME head copy, but eventually you'll need to get the important details onto some sort of record format. Why not do it 100% of the time as I do?

And, well, the SOLE use I can think of for copying in your head would be rag-chews. I GUESS there's still some of that going on. (Jess kiddin, folks...)

Come to think of it, I KNOW I couldn't do 60 wpm without getting it down, letter-for-letter, at the precise time of receipt. I used to work for a super-secret three-letter gummint agency, copying CW for eight hours a day, and many years later as a commercial (ship to shore)

CW operator. In neither case could I possibly afford to copy "behind" for one very important reason which also applies to today's Amateur Radio CW traffic handling methodology. Namely because, there I'd be, merrily copying away, sometimes at better than 50 wpm, when BLAM!, the sending operator would realize he'd made an error, back up (using any number of strange procedures) and (try to) correct himself. If you think that's hard for the receive operator to contend with at slow speeds, try it at 50 - 60 wpm. Point being that if you learn it "right" in advance (according to the Luck Hurder, you-better-dewit-MY-way theory of instruction!), you'll be better off. It's MUCH easier to get where you wanna go (unusually high speed capability -- at least for CW circuits).

This is SO wierd! I'm sitting here trying to ruminate and cogitate to

myself about how to get a couple of thousand-character-per-second modems to talk to each other properly over the radio, while at the same time trying to explain to people methods of learning a skill that will net people together at a paltry 10 - 60 WORDS per MINUTE. Sheesh! Aint the diversity of Amateur Radio grand? Short answer: YES!

-----  
Luck Hurder, KY1T        KY1TLUCK@AOL.COM    ARRL@BIX.COM  
53 Broadview St.        "The Amateur Radio Service opens doors  
Newington CT 06111      to the world for EVERYONE!"  
-----

-----  
Date: 4 Jul 94 13:34:20 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!  
woods.uml.edu!martinja@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: (none)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9407040952.memo.13943@BIX.com>, arrl@BIX.COM writes:

> This is SO wierd! I'm sitting here trying to ruminate and cogitate to  
> myself about how to get a couple of thousand-character-per-second modems  
> to talk to each other properly over the radio, while at the same time  
> trying to explain to people methods of learning a skill that will net  
> people together at a paltry 10 - 60 WORDS per MINUTE. Sheesh! Aint  
> the diversity of Amateur Radio grand? Short answer: YES!

Yes it is! Now if we could only convince the multitude of others that it is okay to maintain a diversity within this hobby. Seems like many are wanting everything for free or for little or no effort. If they had it their way ('an this ain't Burger King) they would suck the diversity out of amateur radio, give everyone the same class of ticket and have everyone operate via the same mode. Am I going a little overboard here? To keep pace with this and other threads via this medium seems one has to step over a little bit. :)

Anyhoo Luck, don't know if you recall or not I had the pleasure of meeting you at the Alamogordo, New Mexico Hamfest in September of '92. Wish I was back there now. I appreciate the wide open spaces that don't seem to be too available in New England. Well, gotta go help with the grill...I can smell the steaks a cookin'....it's the 4th don't ya know...

73 de Jim  
WK1V  
-----

Date: 4 Jul 1994 17:10:33 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!  
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Copying CW below noise  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Ken A. Nishimura (kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU) wrote:

: Why then can you follow along? Because you are doing a correlated  
: reception. You KNOW the song. You KNOW what the next note  
: -Ken

Hi Ken, I can be driving down the hiway in my truck and start thinking  
about a song and do a "correlated reception" right out of the white  
noise... what do you think that SNR is?

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 4 Jul 1994 14:28:30 GMT  
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

: The 'USER' making a 'forward' patch is NOT a control operator of the  
: repeater. The AUTOMATIC CONTROL OPERATOR is in control of the REPEATER  
: STATION during a 'forward' autopatch.

All true, but if the user is making an autopatch while the repeater is  
automatically controlled, that's plain illegal, and the trustee gets  
the pink slip.

This is important. Someone left the open 911 patch turned on the  
other day on one of the local machines, and sure enough, some jokester  
decided that repeated calls to the State Police would be great good  
fun. Troopers take a dim view of that, so I took to disconnecting him  
with the "#" sign until he got tired, which didn't take long,  
fortunately. Someone turned it off eventually, because the same trick  
didn't work the next night (they tried).

You have to have someone around to cut these things off.

: This is true, however I believe you could argue the repeater section  
: (97.205) allows it irrespective of 97.109 (e)

I don't see how. .205 says a repeater station may be automatically

controlled. Or not. .109(e) says that, with the important exception of packet on VHF and up under specific conditions, NO OTHER STATION may pass third party traffic under automatic control. There must be a control operator at the control point. No exception for repeaters is hinted at, so I'm having trouble imagining the argument.

-drt

-----  
David R. Tucker      KG2S                      8P9CL                      drt@world.std.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 4 Jul 1994 13:15:33 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Existing regulations limit our advancement.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <070394222404Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>>

>>I have yet to see any discussion that allows a third party to control a  
>>repeater in automatic control.

>

>How is that? Who is in control the third party or the Automatic Control  
>Operator? (Hint: The Automatic Control Operator is in control of the  
>repeater station the whole time.)

Hint, there is no such thing under the amateur rules as an automatic control \*operator\*. The FCC doesn't send NAIs to machines. The live, human, licensed, control operator \*may\* allow the machine to operate automatically under some conditions, but third party communications is definitely not one of those conditions as is clearly spelled out in 97.109(e) which was written \*specifically\* to address repeater operation.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

-----  
Date: Mon, 04 Jul 1994 14:12:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!  
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2v6tu4\$k4m@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <070394222404Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<1994Jul4.131533.5246@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Hint, there is no such thing under the amateur rules as an automatic  
>control \*operator\*. The FCC doesn't send NAIs to machines. The live,  
>human, licensed, control operator \*may\* allow the machine to operate  
>automatically under some conditions, but third party communications  
>is definitely not one of those conditions as is clearly spelled out  
>in 97.109(e) which was written \*specifically\* to address repeater  
>operation.

Where did you get the information that it was \*specifically\* to address  
repeater operations? It is not in the text of the section.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price  
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what  
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME  
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775  
==+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

-----

Date: 4 Jul 94 15:19:27 -0500  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!  
woods.uml.edu!martinja@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2v6tu4\$k4m@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <070394222404Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<CsF6vJ.Gwv@world.std.com>well  
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

In article <CsF6vJ.Gwv@world.std.com>, drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker)  
writes:

[snip, snip]...

> You have to have someone around to cut these things off.

>

> : This is true, however I believe you could argue the repeater section

> : (97.205) allows it irrespective of 97.109 (e)

>

> I don't see how. .205 says a repeater station may be automatically  
> controlled. Or not. .109(e) says that, with the important exception  
> of packet on VHF and up under specific conditions, NO OTHER STATION  
> may pass third party traffic under automatic control. There must be a  
> control operator at the control point. No exception for repeaters is  
> hinted at, so I'm having trouble imagining the argument.

There are several groups I am familiar with who shut the autopatch off from 23:00 to 06:00 or somewhere thereabouts. The appointed control operators besides the trustee have access to the codes that turn the autopatch back on anytime it is needed. I know someone will ask, "What about someone who needs to use the autopatch for an emergency but doesn't have the code(s) or access to the control link to bring the autopatch up?" My reply..."What about the non-ham who has the same problem?" Logical response: Find a public phone or go to the nearest emergency agency and report the incident. For a ham, try calling a control op on the repeater (or anyone for that matter), if that doesn't work try using another repeater, other band, etc. If all else fails become like a non-ham and do what comes logically. If you have a problem with that, you have my sympathy for being so narrow minded.

Shutting off a device, capable of transmitting third party communications, during the hours a control op is not likely to be present is the most logical thing to do (I asked Mr. Spock and he agrees). Can't get into trouble with the FCC by abiding with the rules.

I have no trouble imagining any argument here. There is no argument. .109(e) is pretty specific about automatic control while transmitting third-party comm. It MAY NOT be done except from 6 meters and shorter wavelength bands and that is for stations retransmitting digital packet radio communications.

.205(d) only says that a repeater may be automatically controlled. Sorry I neglected to get the name of the party you were replying to Dave but I too do not see where this party could argue anything about either one of these two paragraphs cancelling each other out. That is what he implies. One states the condition the other qualifies it. There's no argument...period.

We are dealing with a different breed of person nowadays. He only sees what \*he\* WANTS to see and if an interpretation does not go along with \*his\* line of thinking he'll create an argument and stand by it until death. He won't even believe the people who wrote the rule when they state what their original intention was. No biggie though, he'll get the pink slips and the fines and we'll learn from him. He is one of our best teachers. Hi hi.

73 de WK1V

Jim

-----  
Date: Mon, 4 Jul 1994 23:18:53 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <070194115917Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CsAE9M.M2r@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1994Jul2.214607.9678@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, Æ  
Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <1994Jul2.214607.9678@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary  
Coffman) writes:  
>In article <CsAE9M.M2r@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)  
writes:

>>  
>>Well, \*my\* soldering iron is hot for at least an hour per day [and that's  
>>NOT due to the climate: it only gets to about 85F here in Manoa each  
>>day with nice cooling 15 knot Tradewinds; drops to 75F nights]. It  
>>doesn't matter what a ham is building, just as long as (s)he is  
>>building \*something\*. I choose to be cheap about it and will only work  
>>with discrete parts that I salvage from old radios and TV sets.

>  
>Well I suppose Og felt the same way while chipping his Nth stone axe.  
>What you are saying is equivalent to saying "I don't care what a punk  
>is writing as long as he's writing", even though what he's writing is  
>obscenities spray painted on your house wall. That doesn't wash, or (sic)  
>wash off. It matters very much what an amateur is building. Amateur  
>radio is not supposed to be The Society for Creative Anachronism.

You must be a riot on the local repeaters, taking the opposite  
viewpoint just for sake of arguing:

``Hey Gary - it's daytime''  
``No it's not - it's night time at our antipode.''

Comparing hams furthering themselves by building even the smallest of  
projects such as wave traps for a multiband dipole, a low pass filter,  
an antenna tuner, a PL encoder, a J-pole antenna, etcetera, to  
criminal youths vandalizing property is utterly ridiculous.

Be specific - show us a ham-project that's ``equivalent'' (your choice  
of word) to the act of gang graffiti.

Jeff NH6IL  
-----



Date: 4 Jul 94 20:08:41 -0500

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!woods.uml.edu!  
martinja@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CsAE9M.M2r@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1994Jul2.214607.9678@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<CsFvFI.AHH@news.Hawaii.Edu>†

Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <CsFvFI.AHH@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu  
(Jeffrey Herman) writes:

> Be specific - show us a ham-project that's ``equivalent'' (your choice  
> of word) to the act of gang graffiti.

Uhhhh scuze me for buttin in here >I'm interrupt driven<...

How 'bout spray paintin' ur callsign across the boom of ur newly homebrewed  
tri-bander?

Jez kiddin Jeff...:)

73 de WK1V

Jim

-----  
Date: Mon, 4 Jul 1994 21:56:49 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <070394222404Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<1994Jul4.131533.5246@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <070494141254Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

In article <070494141254Rnf0.78@amcomp.com> dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)  
writes:

>gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>

>>Hint, there is no such thing under the amateur rules as an automatic  
>>control \*operator\*. The FCC doesn't send NAIs to machines. The live,  
>>human, licensed, control operator \*may\* allow the machine to operate  
>>automatically under some conditions, but third party communications  
>>is definitely not one of those conditions as is clearly spelled out  
>>in 97.109(e) which was written \*specifically\* to address repeater  
>>operation.

>

>Where did you get the information that it was \*specifically\* to address  
>repeater operations? It is not in the text of the section.

The ARRL says so, the FCC field bureaus say so, and Part 97 says so.  
A bit of logic would also say so. Consider; what classes of stations  
can operate automatically? Repeaters, packet, and beacons. Now can  
beacons transmit third party traffic? No, so 97.109(e) wasn't written  
for them. Can packet do third party traffic? Yes, and 97.109(e)  
\*specifically exempts\* packet on the 6 m and up bands from the  
prohibition against automatic control of a station transmitting  
third party traffic. That only leaves repeaters that the rule could  
be designed to address. And indeed, that's exactly why it's there,  
and exactly what it means, no automatic control during third party  
traffic on repeaters. What part of NO don't you understand?

Gary

```
--  
Gary Coffman KE4ZV          | You make it,      | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary  
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it.     | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary  
534 Shannon Way           | Guaranteed!      | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary  
Lawrenceville, GA 30244   |                  |
```

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #296  
\*\*\*\*\*